

EDWARD H. KUBO, JR. #2499  
United States Attorney  
District of Hawaii

FLORENCE T. NAKAKUNI #2286  
Chief, Narcotics Section

CHRIS A. THOMAS #3514  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
Room 6100, PJKK Federal Building  
300 Ala Moana Boulevard  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850  
Telephone: (808) 541-2850  
Facsimile: (808) 541-2958  
E-mail: [Chris.Thomas@usdoj.gov](mailto:Chris.Thomas@usdoj.gov)

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	CR. NO. 05-00325 HG
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER CONTINUING TRIAL AND
	)	TO EXCLUDE TIME
vs.	)	
	)	
GARY MATSUO,	(01)	)
BARBARA CORNELIUS,	(02)	)
aka "Barbara Davis,"	)	OLD TRIAL DATE: 04/18/06
and "Aunty,"	)	NEW TRIAL DATE: 07/18/06
AUDREY PULGADOS,	(03)	)
MARK ISHII,	(05)	)
DEREK AHSUI,	(07)	)
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

ORDER CONTINUING TRIAL AND TO EXCLUDE TIME

A Final Pretrial Conference and Government's Oral Motion to Continue Trial in the above-captioned case were held on March 28, 2006. The appearances of all Defendants were waived by the Court. Daniel Pagliarini appeared on behalf of AUDREY

PULGADOS (03); Stuart Fujioka appeared on behalf of MARK ISHII (05) and Lane Takahashi appeared on behalf of DEREK AHSUI (07). The appearances of Glenn Choy on behalf of GARY MATSUO (01) and Jack Schweigert on behalf of BARBARA CORNELIUS (02) were excused based on representations made by the government.

Pursuant to the oral motion to continue the trial date by counsel for Government, with no objection by counsel representing the Co-Defendants, the Court continues the trial date from April 18, 2006 to July 18, 2006. Final Pretrial Conference is scheduled for June 19, 2006, at 10:00 a.m. before the Honorable Barry M. Kurren. Final Pretrial Conference is scheduled for July 7, 2006, at 8:30 a.m. before the Honorable Helen Gilmor. Defendants' pretrial motions are due June 6, 2006, and the Government's responses are due on June 20, 2006.

The Court excludes the time from April 18, 2006, to and including July 18, 2006, from computation under the Speedy Trial Act. The Court finds that the failure to grant a continuance would deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation for trial, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. The Court further finds that the ends of justice served by granting the continuance outweigh the best

interest of the public and defendants in a speedy trial, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (h)(8)(B)(ii).



/s/ Barry M. Kurren  
United States Magistrate Judge  
Dated: March 31, 2006

United States v. Gary Matsuo, et al.

Cr. No. 05-00325 HG

Order Continuing Trial and to  
Exclude Time

